

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed August 3, 2006 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 – 6 are pending in the application. Claims 1-6 have been canceled. New claims 7 - 26 have been added. Support for these changes may be found in the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that no new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

Claims 1 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for one or more reasons.

In response applicant has canceled the claims to address the rejections

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In response applicant has canceled claim 5 to address the rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1 – 3, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Vinod et al.

Applicants respectfully submit that new claim 7 is not anticipated by Vinod. New claim 7 includes the following limitations.

A method comprising:

supplying an initial substrate comprising an SiC support bearing a layer of SiO₂ whereon a thin layer of SiC is transferred, the thin layer of SiC being a 6H or 4H polytype SiC; and
conducting an epitaxy of SiC on the thin layer of SiC at a temperature from 1450°C to 1550°C to obtain 6H or 4H polytype epitaxy on the transferred thin 6H or 4H polytype layer respectively.

(Claim 7) (Emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that Vinod does not disclose the temperature range of 1450°C to 1550°C as claimed to obtain 6H or 4H polytype epitaxy on the transferred thin 6H or 4H polytype layer respectively. Moreover, Vinod discloses a method employing a polysilicon layer disposed upon the oxidized SiC in contrast to the claimed invention.

Applicants therefore, respectfully submit that claim 7 is not anticipated by Vinod et al. Given that all of the claims include similar limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claims 8 – 26 are, likewise, not anticipated by Vinod et al.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Applicants further respectfully submit that the combination of Vinod and Letertre as proffered by the Examiner does not remedy the deficiency of Vinod in this regard.

A thorough reading of Letertre makes clear that Letertre does not disclose the use of an SiO₂ layer between the support and the SiC thin layer as claimed. Therefore the combination of

the cited references does not render the invention as claimed obvious. Applicants further respectfully submit that since this is precisely the prior art disadvantage addressed by the invention, Letertre is not permissibly combined with Vinod in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that Letertre teaches away from the invention as claimed.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

THELEN REID BROWN
RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP

Dated: 1/3/07


Thomas Van Zandt
Reg. No. 43,219

Thelen Reid Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040